STANDARD FORM NO.

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Chief, Publications Division

DATE: 24 April 1950

25X1A

FROM : ███████████████ EC

SUBJECT: Report on ORE Intelligence Support for OPC

I.   General.

A. ORE intelligence support for OPC has been guided by four basic principles:

1. That ORE affords to OPC all reasonable support within its capabilities. Each OPC requirement is accepted or rejected on its own merits. The considerations which govern, subject to this basic principle, are set forth in Section III, below.

2. That, to be effective, such intelligence support must be organized and controlled. The Intelligence Support Branch (ISB) of OPC and the Publications Division (D/Pub) of ORE have been designated to facilitate and regulate substantive contacts between OPC and ORE; all contacts are made through these offices.*

3. That security restrictions upon the substance and procedures involved in ORE intelligence support for OPC are held to the minimum absolutely necessary.

4. That every effort is made, within the limits set by security considerations, to bring the ultimate OPC requester into direct contact with the ultimate ORE producer.

B. In the eleven months (since 12 May 1949) during which this support has been given certain procedures have been evolved. The results of this experience, combined with the suggestions of the ORE Division Chiefs, are represented in the procedures set forth in Section IV and Appendix III.

II. The Extent of ORE Intelligence Support for OPC.

A. The first request for such support was formally made on 12 May 1949. Since that time the support given has steadily increased until, on 24 April 1950, ORE had received 121 requests for written intelligence and 70 recorded requests for oral intelligence. In the first category, 20 projects were rejected, 5 projects were cancelled after acceptance, and 12 projects are presently under way. Oral support was formalized and recorded beginning on 20 January 1950.

---

* D/FE reports that OPC maintains continuous contact with at least one of its area branches to read daily cable traffic. Such contacts have not been notified to D/Pub and are not at present controlled by D/Pub. Possibilities for circumventing existing controls certainly exist in these contacts.

SECRET

B. It is difficult, if not impossible, to predict future trends in this intelligence support. It is not likely that the record of 63 requests (written and oral, including those cancelled or rejected) in March will be repeated, and a figure around half that number is more likely as a monthly constant. Rejections have amounted to around 12% on the average. Cancellations have been negligible. The ratio of written to oral responses has varied between 1:2 and 3:4.

C. The greatest production load has fallen on D/EE, which has turned out 34% of the written responses and 32% of the oral responses. No other division has produced more than 18% in either category.

D. The written responses have varied widely in volume and scope. Some papers have been as large as 50 pages; while no record of the size of papers has been kept, the average is probably about 4 pages. In character, they have generally dealt with specific problems of very limited scope, and have rarely involved general estimates.

E. Some support has been given by ORE divisions in the form of existing papers or drafts which have been lent to OPC. No adequate record of earlier support of this character is available.

F. IAC participation has been sought on three of the written responses, and in one of these, almost the entire job has been sub-contracted to OIR. The extended time which has been required to complete projects involving IAC cooperation makes it appear unwise to go outside ORE on projects for OPC. No such cooperation has been sought since December. Internal ORE coordination has been sought when necessary.

G. Statistics showing the quantitative aspects of ORE intelligence support for OPC are attached as Appendix II.

III. Considerations in the Acceptance of OPC Requests for Intelligence Support.

The decision whether or not to accept an OPC request for intelligence support is made jointly by D/Pub and the division most directly concerned, and in each instance on the merits of the particular request, rather than in accordance with a rigidly established set of criteria. The following general considerations govern:

A. The apparent reasonableness of the request. ORE divisions do not feel that they can afford the time to produce material which is not genuinely needed, or which appears to them to be of a frivolous or inconsequential character. An assumption by the producing ORE division that a request is unreasonable can usually be overcome only by a convincing demonstration that OPC needs the information. This should by all means be forthcoming, subject only to the most urgent security limitations. Clearly, the ideal situation would be one in which ISB screening of

- 2 -

SECRET

requirements could be confidently relied upon by ORE.

B. <u>The nature of the request</u>. ORE is rightly asked for any estimates or interpretations which OPC desires and should make every effort to provide these. ORE does not feel bound, however, to supply information which is readily available elsewhere, or which can be obtained through the reference services of OCD, though it should afford guidance in this respect. It is not efficient for OPC to levy a requirement upon ORE which ORE in turn must farm out to another office or agency, unless ORE is to make a substantive contribution to the finished product in the form of additions or interpretations. On the other hand, if the information is known to be readily available to ORE analysts, as well as to others, speedy satisfaction of the request may justify an inquiry of ORE. In any event, the criterion should be response to OPC's requirement in the most efficient manner possible.

C. <u>The capabilities of the producing Division</u>. Of this matter the Division alone is the judge. Limited capabilities, whether dictated by lack of information , work load, or lack of qualified personnel may dictate a change in the request to correspond to existing capabilities. At all events, OPC must generally accept for its project the priority position dictated by the total work load of the Division concerned.

IV. <u>The Present Procedure</u>.

The present procedure according to which OPC requests are answered has developed pragmatically since May and has been steadily improved through suggestions of the ORE divisions as well as through the cooperation of ISB and D/Pub.

A. <u>Written Requests</u>.

1. ISB approaches D/Pub orally to sound out:
   a. ORE capabilities
   b. Apppropriateness of the request
   c. The nature of additional information required.

2. D/Pub, with or without the OPC representative, takes the matter up with the division principally concerned.

3. D/Pub, on the recommendation of the ORE division chief (or his representative) accepts or rejects the project.

4. If the project is accepted, ISB confirms the request in a memorandum (original and 1 carbon) to D/Pub, supplying such detail as may have been required.
   <u>Note</u>: Procedure to this point is sometimes reversed -- i.e., the written request sometimes precedes consultation with the responsible division.

- 3 -

5. D/Pub "lays on" the project as an IP.
    a. The initiation memorandum
        (1) States the problem, the deadlines, etc., in the usual manner, and includes the ISB case number;
        (2) Is distributed as follows: responsible division, AD/ORE, Coordinator's file, project file;
        (3) The original is forwarded to the responsible division with a carbon copy of the ISB request.
    b. The project is entered in the D/Pub subject file.

6. Wherever necessary or desirable, and at the most effective point in the procedure, D/Pub and ISB arrange for the original OPC requester to meet with the ORE analyst for a clear understanding of the scope, terms of reference, etc.

7. At the prescribed time, the responsible division forwards the finished IP to D/Pub.
    a. Copy is received by D/Pub in final form, ready for transmission, with original and two carbons.
        (1) Original and 1 carbon go to OPC;
        (2) One carbon remains in D/Pub;
        (3) D/Pub forwards the IP forthwith to ISB.
        Note: D/Pub exercises no review function.

B. Oral Requests.

1. ISB orally requests of D/Pub an intelligence contact with an ORE component.

2. D/Pub arranges the contact and records the arrangement, indicating:
    a. ORE division concerned and the name of the analyst consulted;
    b. The name of the OPC representative and that of the ISB member through whom the contact was arranged;
    c. The time and place of the meeting;
    d. The subject under discussion.

3. No other record of the intelligence transmitted is ordinarily maintained.

V. Recommendations.

In the light of the foregoing report, it is recommended:

1. That the draft Operating Procedure, attached as Appendix III, be promulgated to govern ORE intelligence support for OPC.

2. That OPC be urged to coordinate completely within OPC all requests made upon ORE for intelligence support, and that OPC be urged to screen all requests made upon ORE in the light of the considerations set forth in Section III above.

- 4 -

SECRET

3.   That OPC be urged to examine the possibility of informing qualified ORE personnel of the organization of OPC to the degree that ORE intelligence support of OPC would thus be facilitated.

4.   That security precautions be enjoined on all ORE personnel who deal with OPC requests, so that the familiarity with OPC operations which adequate intelligence support requires shall not be allowed to breed casualness with respect to the extraordinary security precautions which are demanded in work for OPC.